

CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL  
OUTGOING LTR NO

000050032

## EG&G ROCKY FLATS

OE ORDER# 4700.1  
25 RF 00129

EG&G ROCKY FLATS, INC  
ROCKY FLATS PLANT P O BOX 464 GOLDEN COLORADO 80402 0464 (303) 966 7000

DIST LTR ENC

MARAL ME

URLINGAME AH X X

USBY WS

RANCH DB

ARNIVAL GJ

AVIS JG

ERRERA DW

RAY RE

EIS JA

LOVER WS

OLAN PM

ANNI BJ

ARMAN LK

EALY TJ

EDAH T

ILBIG JG

JTCHINS NM

ACKSON DT

ELL RE

UESTER AW

ARX GE

CDONALD MM

CKENNA FG

ONTROSE JK

ORGAN RV

OTTER GL

IZZUO VM

ISINC TL

ANDLIN NB

CHWARTZ JK

ETLOCK GH

TEWART DL

TIGER SG X X

OSIN PM

DORHEIS GM

ELSON JM

Humeister, M X X

ESS, T. X X

Howell, L X X

OPRES CONTROL X X

OMN RECORD/080 X X

RAFFIC

ATS/T130G X X

CLASSIFICATION

ONI

UNCLASSIFIED

CONFIDENTIAL

SECRET

AUTHORIZED CLASSIFIER

DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION

REVIEW WAIVER PER

CLASSIFICATION OFFICE

REPLY TO RFP CC NO

OPTION ITEM STATUS

PARTIAL/OPEN

CLOSED

APPROVALS

CB/SGS:

G & TYPYST INITIALS

CB: /A

January 4, 1995

95-RF-00129

Jessie M Roberson  
Acting Director for  
Environmental Restoration Program Division

SITEWIDE TREATMENT FACILITY - MCB-001-95

Refs (a) B I Williamson ltr (12646) to M C Broussard, Operable Unit No 1 and  
Operable Unit No 2 Treatment Plant Consolidation, December 21, 1994

(b) B I Williamson ltr (12949) to M C Broussard, Treatment Plant  
Consolidation Guidance, December 23, 1994

Action Attend meeting on January 5, 1995 to close open items

This letter is in response to the referenced letters requesting project justifications and cost analysis for the Sitewide Treatment Facility Attachment 1 provides information on the anticipated waters requiring on-site treatment and a brief explanation of the benefits of treatment consolidation This information had been provided previously to your staff at a November 30, 1994 meeting Attachment 2 is the schedule for the overall Field Treatability Unit (FTU) integration, including IM/IRA revisions and the addition of iron prefiltration This information was also provided to your staff in a November 30, 1994 meeting

A detailed cost analysis can be completed by January 25, 1995 at a cost of \$6,400 This cost was not included in the existing workscope In order to maintain the critical path schedule, on-going work must continue during this time period or the July operational date cannot be met

The Sitewide Treatment Facility work package was approved by DOE prior to the current fiscal year and staff have been dedicated to fulfilling the workscope as outlined We want to ensure that all DOE issues with any project are resolved It is unfortunate that questions regarding project justification and cost are being raised several months after the Sitewide Treatment Facility project was approved We would like to work with you and your staff to develop a more effective process for project review and approval



Best Available Copy  
ADMIN RECCRD

SW-SW-A-003337

J M Roberson  
95-RF-00129  
January 4, 1995  
Page 2

The schedule for the Sitewide Treatment Facility project had slipped by several weeks to address earlier DOE concerns and has recently been accelerated. We anticipate the project will be back on schedule by mid-January. In order to ensure that we have effectively addressed all DOE concerns without further schedule impact, we recommend a meeting to discuss any remaining issues and have scheduled such a meeting for Thursday, January 5, 1995 at noon in your office.

EG&G Regulatory Experts have reviewed the Sitewide Treatment Facility scope and existing decision documents. It is our opinion that the previously approved Operable Unit 7 (OU 7) Proposed Action Memorandum allows OU 7 waters to be treated at OU 1, OU 2 or the Sitewide Facility. Notification of our choice needs to be documented and submitted but no further reviews or approvals are required. The OU 1 IM/IRA allows the OU 1 treatment facility to treat the contaminants found in the OU 7 waters. Operable Unit 1 Interim Measures/Interim Remedial Action (IM/IRA) will continue to be followed as written. EG&G will modify the OU 2 IM/IRA to remove "at site" treatment and replace with "appropriate treatment at a sitewide facility". This change may require public comment but can be accomplished within the given time frame.

In order to accept additional water sources at the Sitewide Facility a new IM/IRA will be written. Start up operations for OU 2 and OU 7 are not contingent on this Sitewide IM/IRA. EG&G will have modified IM/IRAs to DOE on February 3, 1995 and EG&G will provide the draft Sitewide IM/IRA for review on or before April 1, 1995. It is anticipated a minimum of 180 days after that date are required for final regulatory approval of the sitewide document.

At the December 21, 1994 meeting with your staff it was confirmed that OU 7 would indeed use the OU 1 FTU with the addition of an iron pre-filtration system. The existing treatment unit subcontractor has been requested to procure and install this system at the OU 1 FTU. It will be procured and installed prior to June 1, 1995. It is a grain sand filter iron removal system that supplements the existing system by providing an in-line filter of off loaded waters to remove iron prior to water entering the treatment storage tanks. It is an off-the-shelf pre-designed and assembled unit requiring no engineering or other support. It will be operational prior to the June 30, 1995 OU 7 milestone and will be utilized until the OU 2 rad removal system is in place for OU 7 waters.

We regret our inability to support a requested meeting with Brandon Williamson of your staff on December 22, 1994. Brandon did not attend the December 21, 1994 project meeting and we attempted to work with him to schedule an additional meeting at his request. It is unfortunate that we were unable to find a time that both DOE staff and knowledgeable EG&G staff could meet due to the holiday schedule.

J M Roberson  
95-RF-00129  
January 4, 1994  
Page 3

If you need further information, please feel free to contact me at extension 8517



M C Broussard, Operations Manager  
Environmental Operations Management  
EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc

Attachments  
As Stated (2)

Orig and 1 cc - J M Roberson

cc

F	Lockhart	-	DOE, RFFO
K	Muenchow	-	" "
J	Ramp	-	" "
B I	Williamson	-	" "
B	McCarthy	-	SAIC
J	Stewart	-	"

**WATER DRIVERS:**

<u>Source</u>	<u>Quantity</u>	<u>Start Date</u>	<u>End Date</u>
Scheduled			
881 Hillside Recovery well	0.5 gpm	Collecting	Indefinite
881 Hillside Collection well	0.5 gpm	Collecting	Indefinite
OU-2 SW-59 seep	1 gpm	Collecting	Indefinite
OU-7 seep water	4 gpm	6/30/95	12/97 (est)
Decon-Facility water	5000 gal/mo	Collecting	Indefinite
Purge water	200 gal/quarter	Collecting	Indefinite
Expected			
OU-4 groundwater	4 gpm	Jan 1996	Past FY2000
Planned			
OU-2 pump and treat	10 gpm	Jan 1996	Past FY2000

**COST/BENEFITS:**

The present sampling, operations, and maintenance costs for the OU-1 and OU-2 water treatment facilities is approximately \$3.5 million per year. The total influent to the two facilities, combined, is less than two gallons per minute (less than one gpm during summer/fall). Operations costs for the STF are estimated to be \$3.0 million per year, saving \$500,000 per year as soon as the facility is operational. The only increased costs for treating the OU-7 water at the STF will be for increased chemical use (minimal cost, < 1.5%) and transportation costs (which would be required, wherever the water would be treated). Most of the operations costs are fixed, and irrelevant of the volume of water being treated. By treating the OU-7 water, and other sources, the cost per gallon to treat water decreases significantly, reducing the overall cost to DOE for water treatment.

The \$1.5 million price tag for the STF will payoff after three years of treating the OU-1 and OU-2 water. Since this water is expected to require treatment indefinitely, the STF is the most economic way to handle these waters. Additionally, by utilizing selective treatment, the OU-2 seep water will be treated without using the Radionuclide Removal System, thus eliminating the generation of low-level mixed waste.

In comparison, if the OU-7 seep water required its own treatment facility, design, approval, construction, and operations costs would easily exceed the \$1.5 million level the first year.

The more water that the STF treats, the less the overall cost will be to DOE. By utilizing one treatment facility environmental waters can be treated simply, with less waste generation and lower operating costs.

If the STF project is canceled, significant additional funding will be required for OU-1, OU-2, OU-4, OU-7, and other sources to treat and handle environmental waters. Since all of these water sources are regulated by EPA and the State, funding would have to be pulled from other projects to fund their treatment. Development of the STF will save DOE millions of dollars during the remediation of the RFETS site.





Page 3 of 3

[illegible]